

### Remarks

In the application, claims 22 through 34 are currently pending. No claims have been allowed.

The Final Office Action dated April 2, 2007, has been carefully considered. The Final Office Action objects to claims 16 and 17 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) for failing to limit the subject matter of their antecedent claims. Claims 16 and 17 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. Claims 16, 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed toward non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 7 through 9, and 11 through 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,401,033 ("Paulauskas"). Claims 2 through 6, 10, and 18 through 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in light of Paulauskas and the published article "Virtual GIS: A Real-Time 3D Geographic Information System" ("Koller").

In order to expedite prosecution, all previously pending claims are cancelled, without prejudice, rendering the previous rejections moot. Those rejections have, however, been carefully considered in drafting the new claims. The new claims focus the prosecution on particular embodiments taught by the specification. The Applicants expressly reserve their right to pursue other embodiments in one or more continuation applications.

New independent claim 22 is supported, for example, by the specification at page 6, line 10, through page 8, line 4, and by Figures 2, 5, and 6. Dependent claims 23 and 24 are supported by page 6, line 25, through page 7, line 9. Dependent claims 25 through 27 are supported by page 11, line 12, through page 13, line 26. Dependent claim 28 is supported by page 14, lines 3 through 21. Dependent claim 29 is supported by page 15, line 10, through page 16, line 4. Dependent claims 30 through 33 are supported by page 8, line 5, through page 10, line 18. Independent claim 34 is a Beauregard version of claim 22. No new matter is introduced by these claims.

The method claimed in new independent claims 22 and 34 is patentable over the cited art. For example, Paulauskas does not teach the following elements:

using at least a portion of the second dataset in a computer-game system;

*wherein the computer-game system is separate from the real-world navigation system.*

(Emphasis added.) Koller does not teach:


*using at least a portion of the first dataset in a real-world navigation system; . . . .*

(Emphasis added.) The Applicants believe that an interview with the Examiner to discuss these distinctions over the cited art would save time and would expedite the prosecution of this application.

### Conclusion

The cited art neither anticipates nor renders obvious the currently pending claims. Thus, this application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance. To expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' representative at the number given below to schedule an interview. If the Examiner is satisfied with the currently pending claims, then the Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and pass this application on to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank J. Kozak  
Reg. No. 32,908  
Chief Intellectual Property Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC  
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Suite 900  
Chicago, Illinois 60654  
(312)894-7000 x7371